

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/596,064	Applicant(s) KIM, YI-ZOONG	
	Examiner NICHOLAS A. WILBUR	Art Unit 3672	

All Participants:

(1) NICHOLAS A. WILBUR.

(2) PAUL CHA.

Date of Interview: 12 November 2009

Status of Application: Allowed

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Time: 11:00 AM

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Potential 103 rejection

Claims discussed:

1

Prior art documents discussed:

Chen (US 6,216,717), Graves (US 3,862,876), and Nicoll (US 4,709,430)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: A telephone call was made to Attorney Paul Cha to authorize an Examiner's Amendment to the claims which would place the claims in condition for allowance. In the discussion, it was described how a placing the phrase "for a dredger" and "a discharge pipe located at an upper end of the cover" would put the independent claim 1 into condition for allowance. This was determined in light of a newly found prior art (Chen (US 6,216,717), Graves (US 3,862,876), and Nicoll (US 4,709,430)) that disclose in an obviousness combination all of the elements of claim 1. As presented in the amendment filed 07/06/2009, claim 1 claimed a "cutoff device" which can be read broadly on anything that separates two objects or areas. Therefore, the phrase "for a dredger" was added to help clarify the use of the invention. However, this intended use phrase alone was not enough to define over the prior art of record and additionally adding the discharge pipe as disclosed by the Applicant would make the claims allowable over the combination of Chen, Graves, and Nicoll, because it would not be obvious to place a discharge pipe onto the prior art structure. Attorney Cha has agreed to the proposed claim changes, and the claims as per Examiner's Amendment now stand allowed.